

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY



OCA FILE

*LEG*  
*Sen Danforth*  
*Sen Boren*

OCA: 89-2938

Director of Congressional Affairs


17 August 1989

NOTE FOR: The Director

SUBJECT: Danforth-Boren Amendment to  
the FY 1990 State Department  
Authorization Bill

The attached amendment to the State Department Authorization Bill sponsored by Senators Danforth and Boren calls for a report by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on "the appropriate relationship between the Legislative and the executive branches with respect to the formulation of United States foreign policy." Senator Boren's statement in support of the amendment provides a useful insight into his thinking on this issue. Senators Danforth & Boren seem to be embarrassed and frustrated with the Senate's dilatory impact on foreign policy.

STAT

  
E. Norbert Garrett

Attachment


Distribution:

Original - Addressee


1 - DDCI

1 - ER

① - OCA Subject

1 -  chrono

1 - A/DD/Leg/OCA

DD/OCA:  (17 Aug 1989)

STAT

STAT

S 8398

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 20, 1989

TABLE III.—ITEMIZED U.S. DOLLAR VALUE <sup>1</sup> FOR LICENSED IMPORT/EXPORT TRANSACTIONS WITH CUBA BY UNITED STATES SUBSIDIARIES—Continued

(In millions of dollars and fiscal years)

Country	1982			1983			1984			1985			1986			1987		
	Cuban imports	Cuban exports COM.	N-COM.	Cuban imports	Cuban exports COM.	N-COM.	Cuban imports	Cuban exports COM.	N-COM.	Cuban imports	Cuban exports COM.	N-COM.	Cuban imports	Cuban exports COM.	N-COM.	Imports	Exports COM.	N-COM.
Sweden.....	0	0	0.20	0	0	0.10	0	0	0.26	0	2.46	3.27	0	0	0.09	0	0	0.02
Switzerland.....	0	0	0	0	17.0	0	55.00	27.00	0.03	35.00	25.83	2.46	65.0	11.34	0	25.0	21.9	0
United Kingdom.....	105.00	0	2.00	26.00	2.0	3.00	39.00	0.08	4.00	91.36	37.86	1.23	165.36	0.60	2.57	78.0	5.5	25.3
Venezuela.....	0	0	0	0	0	0.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14.5
West Germany.....	0	0	0.50	0	0	0.60	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.02	0	0	0.17	0	0	0.9

<sup>1</sup> = Numbers rounded. Items may not add to totals due to rounding.  
Source: Treasury Department, Office of Foreign Assets Control, May 1988.

COM. = Consumable goods. N-COM. = Non-Consumable goods. n = Negligible.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my colleague from Florida, Senator BOB GRAHAM, in offering this amendment, which provides for a report to Congress on the involvement of the Cuban Government in drug trafficking.

This amendment could not be more timely. Fidel Castro, his economy collapsing, his Stalinist system increasingly isolated, is engaged in an Orwellian attempt to erase his drug-running record by executing his most popular potential rival, Maj. Gen. Arnaldo Ochoa.

Mr. President, we have major debates in the Senate on whether or not to approve certifications of in Latin America, such as Mexico or The Bahamas, are fully cooperating with American drug interdiction efforts. Fidel Castro is fully cooperating—not with us, but with the drug runners.

Just a couple of weeks ago it was reported that two Cuban MiG's were in the area of a drug drop off Cuba's shores. The MiG's not only did not shoot down the drug traffickers as Castro boasted he would do, but Cuban air controllers warned our customs planes to stay away. The drug traffickers essentially completed the transfer of drugs, dropped from the drug runner's plane to a waiting boat, without any interference from Cuban security forces.

The 1986 President's Commission on Organized Crime found that Cuba plays a central role in the global narcotics flow. It went on, Mr. President, to conclude that Cuba's involvement in drug running, along with other Communist countries, was a clear and dedicated part of Cuba's policy of attempting to undermine Western societies, and to use the funds generated by such activity to finance and arm various Marxist insurgent groups around the world.

Fidel Castro's narcotics linkage to terrorist organizations, like the notorious M-19 group in Colombia, has been corroborated numerous times by evidence and testimony by drug informants. In February 1988, former Consul General Jose Blandon to the Panamanian drug czar Gen. Manuel Noriega, testified before our own Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Fidel Castro's personal involvement with the Medellin drug cartel and the M-19 terrorist organization.

This testimony was further corroborated in 1989, when a Cuban intelligence officer defected to the United States and reported detailed information on how Colombian drugs are transshipped through Cuba, with the assistance of the Cuban coast guard.

Mr. President, the point I am making is that it is well documented by our intelligence and investigative agencies that Cuba's involvement with the drug cartel plays an important role in Cuba's foreign policy. It is, therefore, inconceivable that as leader of a nation where all foreign policy decisions originate from Mr. Castro, that he would not have known about an activity that was, and is, so intertwined with his country's foreign policy.

Mr. President, either Mr. Castro was completely ignorant about his own country's participation as a transshipment point for drugs—which means a hand-full of corrupt officers were able to subvert Cuba's entire air and coastal defense forces, to permit an almost continual penetration of Cuban territory by drug runners without his knowledge—or Mr. Castro was fully aware of what was happening.

Mr. President, Fidel Castro has not survived as dictator of Cuba for three decades by being ignorant of what his officers were doing.

The purpose of the report we are requesting, Mr. President, is to determine exactly what Mr. Castro knew and when did he know it. We are also seeking to determine the full extent of Cuban support and assistance to the drug trade, and what role the funds generated from the drug trade play in supporting international terrorism and Cuban-sponsored insurgent groups.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments of the Senator from Florida.

The amendments (Nos. 371, 372, and 373) were agreed to.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendments were agreed to.

Mr. GRAHAM. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order that I might offer an amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

## AMENDMENT NO. 374

Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Missouri (Mr. DANFORTH), for himself and Mr. BOREN, proposes an amendment numbered 374.

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. . . ROLE OF THE CONGRESS IN THE FORMULATION OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY.

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, upon consultation with the Secretary of State, shall issue a report to the Senate by December 31, 1989, on the appropriate relationship between the Legislative and the executive branches with respect to the formulation of United States foreign policy.

Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, this is the amendment that Senator BOREN and I are offering. We have a 20-minute time agreement on this amendment.

I ask I be notified at the expiration of 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, the last time we had a State Department authorization bill on the floor of the Senate, 86 floor amendments were adopted to that bill. At that time, Senator BOREN and I made the point that that was no way to conduct the foreign policy of the United States. The major policy matters were being debated and voted on on the basis of floor amendments being written out almost literally on the backs of envelopes; that there was no sense of unity in the development of foreign policy, no sense of working out arrangements between the executive branch and the Congress. That, instead, Senators were answering vote bells and running over to vote on whatever sense-of-the-Senate resolution or whatever provision was being offered on the spur of the moment on the floor of the Senate.

We have made that point repeatedly over the last 2 years. We have written several op-ed pieces in the press, and immediately before the last election, Senator BOREN and I and other Senators wrote letters to the two Presiden-

July 20, 1989

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8399

tial candidates, asking their commitment, should they be elected, to try their hand at establishing a more coordinated approach to foreign policy and a bipartisan approach to foreign policy.

Both candidates answered affirmatively in response to that request and immediately after the election, even before he took office, the then President-elect Bush stated his views that he wanted to get together with Congress and try to form a bipartisan foreign policy.

In his inaugural address the President said that foreign policy is a matter where differences should stop at the water's edge.

We believe that we had an agreement between the leadership of Congress and the leadership of the two Foreign Relations Committees on the one hand and the administration on the other hand, that with the new President would come greater consultation by the White House in exchange for more forbearance on the part of the Congress.

We believe the administration has done a pretty good job of consulting with Congress during the Bush administration. But this bill, Mr. President, indicates that clearly something has come a cropper in our efforts to formulate a bipartisan and a unified foreign policy. At least 60 amendments at my count have been considered by the Senate and 42 amendments were considered on Wednesday alone; 42 foreign policy amendments considered on this bill.

Mr. President, that is no way for the Senate of the United States to conduct foreign policy. That is no way for the Government of the United States to speak to the rest of the world. If the Senate votes 42 times on a single day on foreign policy matters, clearly, we are not doing it on a considered basis.

What we have said in the amendment that we have just offered is, let us go back to the drawing board with this administration. Let us have the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, in consultation with the Secretary of State, report back to the Senate on what the appropriate role of the Congress should be in the creation of foreign policy.

Mr. President, my hope would be that somehow we could reestablish a consensus in foreign affairs in this country and somehow we could regain a sense that the role of the U.S. Senate is something other than the back of the envelope approach that we have taken with this State Department authorization bill and that we took back in 1987.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. I yield myself such time as I need.

I think this is an excellent amendment. I have looked at it. I am very glad indeed to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, Senator BOREN, who is the coauthor of this amendment, is presently on his way to the floor of the Senate. I regret that I had to offer this when he was not on the floor, but because of the Specter amendment situation, I was forced to do it.

I ask the Chair how much more time is left on this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise that there are 5 minutes and 5 seconds on the side of the Senator from Missouri and approximately 10 minutes remaining for the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, how much more time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 30 seconds.

Mr. DANFORTH. I wonder if the committee chairman would be willing to yield his time to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. PELL. I will be glad to. I would like to save 2 minutes for myself.

Mr. DANFORTH. I yield my remaining seconds to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for up to 7½ minutes.

Mr. BOREN. I thank the Chair. I do not think I will consume all 7½ minutes. I will endeavor to state my thoughts more rapidly. We have been going through now the last several hours a process that we seem to repeat each year when it comes time to consider this particular bill, and that is the process of attempting to micromanage the foreign policy of the United States, to display the obvious facts to our constituency that there are 100 Members of the United States Senate that on any given day feel an obligation to demonstrate that at least for 10 minutes on the Senate floor they should act as Secretary of State of the United States or perhaps try to act on behalf of the President of the United States in making foreign policy for this country and speaking for this country.

Nothing diminishes the influence of this country more than our failure to speak to the rest of the world with a single voice. Nothing is more damaging when we are dealing with sensitive international issues than to have amateur hour on the floor of the United States Senate in which each and every one of us decide to weigh it in on sensitive issues that have been delicately balanced and negotiated between our

country and other nations and leaders in those nations, issues which have very serious domestic political impact within those countries in a manner which sometimes exposes those very people in the government of other countries who have been trying to help us to serious jeopardy.

As a general rule, we honor the committee system in this institution. We recognize the expertise of those Members who have been serving on those particular committees. We attempt to not undo the work and careful consideration given to legislation by committees on the Senate floor.

Mr. President, I think it is high time that we return to that policy when it comes to making decisions about matters like those we have been debating on this floor over the past several hours and days. It is time for us to stop inflicting damage on the national interest of the United States by dragging out onto the floor of the Senate for public discussion matters that are more sensitively and appropriately debated within the proper framework of consultation between the executive branch and the Congress.

This President has gone a long way toward trying to implement a policy under which the Congress would give up its attempts to micromanage foreign policy in return for real consultation with the executive branch in advance of policy decisions. The President has put together an informal working group which now meets regularly with him in the Cabinet Room composed of the Speaker, the minority leader of the House, the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, the chairmen and ranking members in both Houses of the Committees on Foreign Relations, Armed Services, and Intelligence, and from time to time other Members, assistant leaders, other members of the leadership team in both the Democratic and Republican Parties in both Houses.

The President has gone a long way in making these discussions, which take place on a regular basis, meaningful, discussing the real policy decisions which have to be made by the administration and listening intently to and getting input from Members of Congress on these decisions before they are made.

This Secretary of State, to my knowledge, had come to the Senate more often than any other Secretary of State that I can remember to consult with individual Members of Congress with expertise and interest in certain fields.

Mr. President, it appears to me that the administration is seeking to do its part, and I am disappointed that we as an institution have failed to live up to our responsibility to work in a responsible way, a nonsensational way, a way which does not make headlines, a way which does not get us on television, to deal with the kinds of sensitive issues where they should be dealt with, in

S 8400

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 20, 1989

consultation between the two branches of Government so that what we can do is in the interest of the United States of America.

We need to get back to the day we had in this country when President Eisenhower used to sit down with Senator Johnson, Lyndon Johnson, the majority leader, Speaker Rayburn, Senator Dirksen, and the leadership of the Congress and thrash out what the policies of this country should be. It was done in private so that the sensitivities of other nations would not be offended so that we would not make it impossible for the leaders of other nations to cooperate with us and then to present a bipartisan consensus in a unified front and face to the rest of the world.

Mr. President, I sincerely believe the exercise we have engaged in on this floor is not only institutionally irresponsible from the point of view of the duty and responsibility of the Senate, our responsibility to the executive branch, I think it has been grossly unfair to the dedication and hard work of the Committee on Foreign Relations itself.

It is time that we stood back and looked at ourselves as the people in this country are seeing us, acting irresponsibly, acting in a manner which does not bring credit to this institution, and it is time for us to decide among ourselves to change the way we do business when it comes to airing the dirty linen of foreign policy on the floor of the Senate and showing ourselves more and more fragmented to the rest of the world. It is not the way to do business.

Therefore, I am proud to join Senator DANFORTH in offering this proposal that the executive branch, the Committee on Foreign Relations, those charged with appropriate institutional responsibility in the Senate sit down together, and then they report back to the Senate the appropriate way for us to handle these kinds of issues rather than having a laundry list of amendments which seems to grow each year in number to be aired out here on the floor of the Senate to further divide our people, to further confuse and demoralize our allies around the world, and to undermine our own national interests.

So I commend the Senator from Missouri for offering this amendment. I am proud to join with him in cosponsoring this amendment. I hope that it will be overwhelmingly accepted by our colleagues. I hope it will be taken seriously by our colleagues. Let us go back to a process which has worked in the past, that of genuine consultation between the two branches of Government, consultation that can be carried on in a manner appropriate to the sensitivity of the wishes which are being discussed. Let us go back to honoring committee responsibility within the Senate and allowing the committee system to work in a way that will be effective and efficient to protect our

institutional interests and the interests of our country.

Mr. President, I urge adoption of this amendment. Let us take a step toward restoring the reputation of the Senate as a responsible partner in the making of foreign policy for this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I commend my colleagues from Missouri and Oklahoma for their remarks. As one who has sat now through 6 days of deliberations, I fully concur that there are many, many amendments, but this bill is different from the 1987 bill. Almost all the amendments that have been accepted have simply been sense-of-the-Congress amendments. We have rejected almost every attempt to tie the President's hands firmly in foreign policy, most notably today in our vote on the PLO. I hope we will continue to support our President and reject all micromanagement amendments, notably to tell the President how to build an Embassy in Moscow, what to do about the Soviet Embassy on Mount Alto, and how to run the State Department personnel system.

Finally, I would note that of the 25 remaining amendments, all but 2 of them are from the President's own party.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 374) was agreed to.

Mr. DANFORTH. I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Pennsylvania, Senator SPECTER, is to be recognized.

What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. PELL. At this point, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the next order of business is recognition of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] for the offering of an amendment.

Mr. CHAFEE. Are there objections to setting aside that amendment and proceeding to call up an amendment? I so ask.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator could simply ask consent that he be so allowed.

Mr. CHAFEE. I so ask, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. PELL. Reserving the right, what was the request again.

Mr. CHAFEE. To set aside the Specter amendment and go to my amendment.

Mr. PELL. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? If not, the Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

## AMENDMENT NO. 361

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, my amendment is at the desk and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], for himself, Mr. HATFIELD, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. LUGAR, and Mr. INOUE, proposes an amendment numbered 361.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island. I send it to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to calling off reading of the first-degree amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

The United States recognizes that Israel has experienced difficulties with violence generated in some schools in some areas of the West Bank;

On February 3, 1988, July 21, 1988, and January 20, 1989, Israeli military authorities announced the closure of schools "until further notice," and schools have been open for only a few weeks during that time;

The school closures have affected all 1,194 kindergartens, primary and secondary schools in the West Bank;

Universities and community colleges in the West Bank have been closed for over one year;

The closure orders have affected all West Bank schools including public, private, and United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) schools, as well as vocational training centers and universities;

The school closures have affected 320,000 school-aged children and 18,000 university and community college students, or roughly 40 percent of the population of the West Bank;

The continuation of education in any form, including informal makeup classes outside of school premises or the distribution of homework has been prohibited;

The school closures have the most profound impact on primary-aged schoolchildren inasmuch as educators believe that the denial of instruction to students at certain stages in their education leaves serious gaps in their cognitive development which are very difficult to correct at a later stage;